UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,789	09/05/2003	Thomas J. Foth	F-627	8969

7590 02/19/2008

Pitney Bowes Inc.
Intellectual Property &Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484

EXAMINER	
PARK, GEORGE M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/656,789	FOTH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GEORGE PARK	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is longer than 150 words. Also, the term "sever" (line 8) should be --server--. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "tabs 1442T" (page 8, paragraph [0036], line 3) should be -- tabs 142T--, "sever 12" (page 12, paragraph [0047], line 2 and page 13, paragraph [0054], line 1) should be -- server 12--

and "tabs 234" (page 12, paragraph [0048], line 3) should be -- tabs 236--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 12 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: "sever" (claim 12, line 6 and claim 25, line 1) should be --server--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 9, 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding to claim 9, it is not clear whether "a method as described in claim 1 where said other enterprise responses..." is dependent on claim 1 or claim 8 instead. For the purpose of examining, the examiner interprets claim 9 as dependent on claim 8.

Regarding to claim 20, it is not clear whether "a system as described in claim 12 where said other enterprise responses..." is dependent on claim 12 or claim 19 instead. For the purpose of examining, the examiner interprets claim 20 as dependent on claim 19.

Regarding to claim 27, "A system as described in claim 28..." is an improper dependent claim. It is not clear whether claim 27, "A system as described in claim 28.." is dependent on claim 25 or claim 26. For the purpose of examining, the examiner interprets claim 27 dependent on claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188497 A1).

Regarding to claim 1, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Cerwin discloses a method for controlling a system for automatically generating and distributing information (paragraph [0015], lines 16-20), comprising the steps of: a) monitoring (i.e. analyzing) a document as it is processed by a user (paragraph [0015], lines 16-17); b) identifying a reference to a party in said document (i.e. customer contact) (paragraph [0005], lines 4-6); c) accessing a database of information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties (paragraph [0005], lines 1-10). However, Cerwin does not explicitly disclose if a record relating to said party exists in said database, providing information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to said user. It is common knowledge in the prior art that once information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties are accessed and exists in said database, the information would then be provided to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Cerwin with the feature of if a record relating to said party exists in said database, providing information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to said user, as Cerwin is directed to the method for controlling a system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the system user information relating to a relationship between an enterprise and party once it has been accessed, if it exists, in the database.

Regarding to claim 2, Cerwin discloses where said information is generated, at least in part, based upon survey responses by system users (paragraph [0027], lines 8-11).

9. Claims 3-5, 12-16, 23, 25-27, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188497 A1) in view of Shoemaker et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167197 A1).

Regarding to claim 3, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not explicitly disclose where said user is requested to respond to a survey when said information is provided and said user's response to said survey is used to update said information. Shoemaker et al. discloses where said user is requested to respond (i.e. action plans) (paragraph [0006], lines 1-5) to a survey when said information is provided and said user's response to said survey is used to update said information (paragraph [0023], lines 12-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Cerwin with the feature of where said user is requested to respond to a survey when said information is provided and said user's response to said survey is used to update said information as taught by Shoemaker et al., as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to the method for controlling a system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to update the information once a user responds to a survey.

Regarding to claims 4 and 5, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose where said information provided relates to a value of said relationship to said enterprise (as per claim 4) and where said information includes further information relating to a quality of said relationship (as per claim 5). Shoemaker et al. discloses survey asking questions concerning the areas of value (as per claim 4) and quality (as per claim 5) (paragraph [0027], lines 15-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Cerwin with the feature of where said information provided relates to a value of said relationship to said enterprise (as per claim 4) and where said information includes further information relating to a quality of said relationship (as per claim 5) as taught by Shoemaker et al., as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to the method for controlling a system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide information regarding the value and quality of the relationship.

Regarding to claim 12, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Cerwin discloses a system for automatically generating and distributing information (paragraph [0015], lines 16-20) comprising: a) a computer for processing documents (paragraph [0064], lines 4-7, see fig. 6) ; b) a database system comprising: b1) a database of information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties (paragraph [0005], lines 1-10); c) said computer is programmed to: c1) monitor (i.e. analyze) a document as it is processed by a user on said computer (paragraph [0015], lines 16-17); c2) identify a reference to a party in said document (i.e. customer contact)

(paragraph [0005], lines 4-6); However, Cerwin does not explicitly disclose a server for controlling access to said database and for communicating with said computer; where and c3) send information identifying said party to said server; and where d) said server is programmed to: d1) receive said identifying information; d2) access said database for information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party; and d3) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, send said information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to said computer. Shoemaker et al. discloses a computer server (paragraph [0017], lines 3-6) linked to various computers with access to various databases (paragraph [0017], lines 16-19). Also, it is common knowledge in the prior art that once information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties are accessed and exists in said database, the information would then be provided to the computer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Cerwin with the feature of a server for controlling access to said database and for communicating with said computer; where and c3) send information identifying said party to said server; and where d) said server is programmed to: d1) receive said identifying information; d2) access said database for information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party; and d3) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, send said information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to said computer as taught by Shoemaker et al, as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to the system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been for the

computer to have access to various databases of information relating to relationships and to communicate with the computer.

Regarding to claim 13, Cerwin discloses where said information is generated, at least in part, based upon survey responses by system users (paragraph [0027], lines 8-11).

Regarding to claim 14, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose where said server is further programmed to send a request to said computer for said user to respond to a survey when said information is provided and to update said information with new information reflecting said user's response to said survey. Shoemaker et al. discloses where said user is requested to respond (i.e. action plans) (paragraph [0006], lines 1-5) to a survey when said information is provided and said user's response to said survey is used to update said information (paragraph [0023], lines 12-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Cerwin with the feature of where said server is further programmed to send a request to said computer for said user to respond to a survey when said information is provided and to update said information with new information reflecting said user's response to said survey as taught by Shoemaker et al., as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to the system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to update the information once a user responds to a survey.

Regarding to claim 15 and 16, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose where said information sent relates to a value of said relationship to said enterprise (as per claim 15) and where said information includes further information relating to a quality of said relationship (as per claim 16). Shoemaker et al. discloses survey asking questions concerning the areas of value (as per claim 15) and quality (as per claim 16) (paragraph [0027], lines 15-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the system of Cerwin with the feature of where said information sent relates to a value of said relationship to said enterprise (as per claim 15) and where said information includes further information relating to a quality of said relationship (as per claim 16) as taught by Shoemaker et al., as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to the system for controlling a system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide information regarding the value and quality of the relationship.

Regarding to claims 23 and 29, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Cerwin discloses a computer programmed to process documents (paragraph [0064], lines 4-7, see fig. 6) (as per claim 23) and a computer readable medium for providing instructions to a computer (as per claim 29) (i.e. software) (paragraph [0022], lines 10-14), said instructions controlling said computer to: a) monitor (i.e. analyze) a document as it is processed by a user on said computer (paragraph [0015], lines 16-17); b) identify a reference to a party in said document (i.e. customer contact) (paragraph [0005], lines 4-6). However, Cerwin does not explicitly disclose sending

information identifying said party to a server; and d) receive and display to said user information relating to a relationship between an enterprise and said party. Shoemaker et al. discloses a computer server (paragraph [0017], lines 3-6) linked to various computers with access to various databases (paragraph [0017], lines 16-19). Also, it is common knowledge in the prior art that once information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties are accessed and exists in said database, the information would then be provided to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the computer (as per claim 23) and computer readable medium (as per claim 29) of Cerwin with the feature of sending information identifying said party to a server; and receiving and displaying to said user information relating to a relationship between an enterprise and said party as taught by Shoemaker et al., as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to a computer (as per claim 23) and computer readable medium (as per claim 29) programmed to process documents. The motivation for doing so would have been for the computer to have access to various databases of information relating to relationships and to communicate with the computer.

Regarding to claims 25 and 30, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Cerwin discloses a database system for automatically generating and distributing information to system users (as per claim 25) (paragraph [0005], lines 1-10) and a computer readable medium (as per claim 30) (paragraph [0022], lines 10-14) to a) receive information identifying a party (i.e. customer profile) (paragraph [0005], lines 4-6); b) access said database for information relating to a relationship between an

enterprise and said party (paragraph [0005], lines 4-10). However, Cerwin does not explicitly disclose a server for controlling access to a database and c) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, send said information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to a computer for display to a system user. Shoemaker et al. discloses a computer server (paragraph [0017], lines 3-6) linked to various computers with access to various databases (paragraph [0017], lines 16-19). Also, it is common knowledge in the prior art that once information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties are accessed and exists in said database, the information would then be provided to a system user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database system (as per claim 25) and computer readable medium (as per claim 30) of Cerwin with the feature of a server for controlling access to a database and c) if a record relating to said party exists in said database, send said information relating to a relationship between said enterprise and said party to a computer for display to a system user as taught by Shoemaker et al, as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to a server and computer readable medium for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to for the system user to have access to various databases of information relating to relationships between an enterprise and other parties.

Regarding to claims 26 and 27, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose where said information provided relates to a value of said relationship to said enterprise (as per claim 26) and where said

information includes further information relating to a quality of said relationship (as per claim 27). Shoemaker et al. discloses survey asking questions concerning the areas of value (as per claim 26) and quality (as per claim 27) (paragraph [0027], lines 15-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the server of Cerwin with the feature of where said information provided relates to a value of said relationship to said enterprise (as per claim 26) and where said information includes further information relating to a quality of said relationship (as per claim 27) as taught by Shoemaker et al., as both Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. are directed to the server for controlling access to a database for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide information regarding the value and quality of the relationship.

10. Claims 6, 17 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188497 A1) in view of Shoemaker et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167197 A1) and further in view of Crockett et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0039631 A1).

Regarding to claims 6, 17 and 28, Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. do not disclose where said further information includes a weighted sum of ratings for a plurality of characteristics of said relationship. Crockett et al. discloses an assessment of customer relationship management capabilities using a weighted score (paragraph [0007], lines 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, system and server of Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. with the feature of said further information includes a weighted sum of ratings for a plurality of characteristics of said relationship as taught by Crockett et al., as Cerwin, Shoemaker et al. and Crockett et al. are directed to the method, system and server for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to give more weight to certain characteristics in the overall assessment of the relationship.

11. Claims 7, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188497 A1) in view of Shoemaker et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167197 A1) and further in view of Parker et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0052774 A1).

Regarding to claims 7, 18 and 24, Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. do not disclose where said further information is provided in graphical form. Parker et al. discloses displaying information (i.e. survey responses) in graphical from (i.e. charts and graphs) (paragraph [0032], lines 10-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, system and computer of Cerwin and Shoemaker et al. with the feature of where said further information is provided in graphical form as taught by Parker et al, as Cerwin, Shoemaker et al., and Parker et al. are directed to the method, system and computer for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for

doing so would have been to display the information in a user-friendly way (i.e. charts and graphs).

12. Claims 8, 10, 11, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188497 A1) in view of Couchot et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065553 A1).

Regarding to claim 8 and 19, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose where said information is generated, at least in part, based upon survey responses by other enterprises. Couchot et al. discloses gathering information (i.e. data) from both clients and providers (i.e. other enterprises) (see fig. 2, paragraph [0005], lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Cerwin with the feature of where said information is generated, at least in part, based upon survey responses by other enterprises as taught by Couchot et al., as both Cerwin and Couchot et al. are directed to the method and system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to gather and analyze information regarding the relationship from both the enterprise and other parties.

Regarding to claims 10 and 21, Cerwin disclose the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose including the further step of formulating an inquiry to an information source in response to a request from said user (as per claim 10) and where said computer is further programmed to receive a request from said user

for information from other information sources and said server is further programmed to formulate an inquiry to an information source in response to said request (as per claim 21). Couchot et al. discloses formulating an inquiry (i.e. search) to an information source in response to a request from said user (paragraph [0099], lines 4-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Cerwin with the feature of including the further step of formulating an inquiry to an information source in response to a request from said user (as per claim 10) and where said computer is further programmed to receive a request from said user for information from other information sources and said server is further programmed to formulate an inquiry to an information source in response to said request (as per claim 21) as taught by Couchot et al., as both Cerwin and Couchot et al. are directed to the method and system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to have search information regarding another party with which the enterprise has a relationship.

Regarding to claims 11 and 22, Cerwin discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin does not disclose where the scope of said inquiry, and to which information source, or sources, said inquiry is to be sent, are determined based on the nature and importance of the matter to which said inquiry relates. Couchot et al. discloses where the scope of said inquiry (i.e. search), and to which information source, or sources, said inquiry (i.e. search) is to be sent, are determined based on the nature and importance of the matter (i.e. attributes, line of business, status, etc.) to which said

inquiry relates (paragraph [100], lines 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Cerwin with the feature of where the scope of said inquiry, and to which information source, or sources, said inquiry is to be sent, are determined based on the nature and importance of the matter to which said inquiry relates as taught by Couchot et al., as both Cerwin and Couchot et al. are directed to the method and system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to have search information regarding another party with which the enterprise has a relationship, specifically based on the nature and importance of the matter to which the inquiry (i.e. search) relates.

13. Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cerwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0188497 A1) in view of Couchot et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065553 A1) and further in view of Feher (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0002893 A1).

Regarding to claims 9 and 20, Cerwin and Couchot et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Cerwin and Couchot et al. do not disclose where said other enterprise responses are collected and distributed by a third party in a confidential and secure manner to protect critical confidential information of said other enterprises. Feher discloses collecting and distributing data obtained from a third party web site or a third party database (paragraph [0020], lines 1-9, paragraph [0027], lines 1-2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method and system of Cerwin and Couchot

et al. with the feature of where said other enterprise responses are collected and distributed by a third party in a confidential and secure manner to protect critical confidential information of said other enterprises as taught by Feher, as Cerwin, Couchot et al. and Feher are directed to the method and system for automatically generating and distributing information. The motivation for doing so would have been to protect critical confidential information of the enterprises.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Couchot et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0078756 A1) discloses a method and system for processing performance data describing a relationship between a provider and client. Rogers et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0093257 A1) discloses a system and method for customer satisfaction surveys.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GEORGE PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-3547. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GP
2/11/08

/Jonathan G. Sterrett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623